

REMARKS

Claims 1-16 remain pending in the application. Claims 1, 6, 11 and 16 have been amended. Reconsideration is respectfully requested in light of the following remarks.

The Examiner rejected claims 1, 3-6, 8-11, 13-15 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Schmeidler et al. (U.S. Patent 6,374, 402) (hereinafter “Schmeidler”), and claims 2, 7, 12 and 16 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schmeidler in view of McBrearty et al. (U.S. Publication 2004/0015585) (hereinafter “McBrearty”). Applicants respectfully traverse these rejection for at least the reasons presented below.

Regarding claim 1, Schmeidler fails to disclose, in response to receiving a data access request from a client, a metadata server determining a maximum expiration time indicated by a next scheduled quiesce time, wherein the data access request is for data that is also accessible by one or more other clients each having a corresponding unexpired token, and wherein said quiesce time is a time when exclusive access to the data is required by a task; generating an access token that grants the client access to data stored on one or more storage devices associated with the metadata server, wherein the access token comprises an expiration time; and wherein said generating an access token comprises setting the expiration time of the access token to be no later than the maximum expiration time. Schmeidler describes a system for delivery of on-demand content over a broadband access network. Schmeidler teaches the use of a RAFT token granting access to particular content for a specified time period. However, neither Schmeidler nor McBrearty describes anything regarding a scheduled quiesce time when exclusive access to shared data is required by a task, and setting the expiration time of an access token to be no later than a maximum expiration time indicated by such a scheduled quiesce time.

Similar remarks apply in regard to the other independent claims.

Regarding both the § 102 and § 103 rejections, Applicants also assert that numerous ones of the dependent claims recited further distinctions over the cited art. However, since the rejections have been shown to be unsupported for the independent claims, a further discussion of the dependent claims is not necessary at this time.

CONCLUSION

Applicants submit the application is in condition for allowance, and prompt notice to that effect is respectfully requested.

If any fees are due, the Commissioner is authorized to charge said fees to Meyertons, Hood, Kivlin, Kowert, & Goetzel, P.C. Deposit Account No. 501505/5760-19800/RCK.

Respectfully submitted,

/Robert C. Kowert/
Robert C. Kowert, Reg. #39,255
Attorney for Applicants

Meyertons, Hood, Kivlin, Kowert, & Goetzel, P.C.
P.O. Box 398
Austin, TX 78767-0398
Phone: (512) 853-8850

Date: July 26, 2007